REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on December 28, 2006, in which all of the pending claims (1, 4-6, 8-13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21 and 27-38) were rejected. Specifically, all of the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridgelall (USP 7,039,027) in view of Schilling et al. (USP 6,314,126).

With this Amendment, both of the independent claims (1 and 8) are amended to recite that the dual distance terminal transmits a beacon signal through the dual distance network server to the destination network to which the dual distance terminal is switched. This amendment is supported by the specification at page 11, line 1 – page 12, line 20. This feature is similar to the feature previously recited in dependent claim 13 (which has now been canceled to avoid redundancy). In rejecting claim 13, the Examiner contended that the Bridgelall patent teaches that "where the dual distance terminal requests seamless switching from the short distance network to the long distance network based on its service level, the dual distance terminal terminates data transmission through the short distance radio frequency function entity the dual distance terminal and sends a beacon signal to the short distance communication function entity in the terminal (see col. 14, lines 23-28), the beacon signal is then transmitted to the dual distance network server by the short distance AP, the dual distance network server informs the long distance communication function entity to be accessed by the dual distance terminal of the receipt, and determines the service queue position which the dual distance terminal is arranged in the long distance network function entity based on its service level (see col. 14, line 38 through col. 15, line 19)."

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's contention that the Bridgelall patent discloses transmitting a beacon signal is incorrect. The Bridgelall patent does not disclose, teach or suggest the dual distance terminal transmitting a beacon signal through the dual distance network server to the destination network to which the dual distance terminal is switched, when switching between short and long distance communication networks is requested. The Bridgelall patent discloses that in order to switch from a WLAN (short distance communication network) to a WWAN (long distance communication network),

the WWAN Radio sub-system registers to the WWAN network and is then able to switch from the WLAN to the WWAN (see, e.g., col. 14, lines 31-34). However, there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion of the dual distance terminal transmitting a beacon signal to the WWAN in this scenario, as is recited in amended claims 1 and 8. By contrast, communications with the short distance network and the long distance network are time multiplexed in the Bridgelall system when switching is to occur, which precludes the transmission of a beacon signal.

In order to reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See M.P.E.P. 2143.03, citing In re Royka, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1964). In this case, amended claims 1 and 8 each recite that the dual distance terminal transmits a beacon signal through a dual distance network server to the destination network to which the dual distance terminal is switched when switching between long and short distance communication networks is requested. Neither the Bridgelall patent (for the reasons discussed above) nor the Schilling et al. patent (which was not cited for this teaching) teaches or suggests this limitation, nor does any other reference of record. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1 and 8 (as amended) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Claims 4-6, 9-12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21 and 27-38 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 8, and are allowable therewith. In addition, In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the combinations of features recited in claims 4-6, 9-12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21 and 27-38 are patentable on their own merits, although this does not need to be specifically addressed herein since any claim depending from a patentable independent claim is also patentable. See M.P.E.P. 2143.03, citing In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all the pending claims (1, 4-6, 8-12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21 and 27-38) is respectfully requested. If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 3/28/07 By: _____

Alan M. Koenck, Reg. No. 43,724
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580

AMK